INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

CENTRE DE RECHERCHES POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT INTERNATIONAL

IDRC-002 e (Français au verso)

Statement to the Inaugural Meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Development Research Centre

Ottawa, Canada, October 26, 1970

W. David Hopper, President.

It is with a personal pride and pleasure tempered by a deep and sobering sense of imminent adventure that I extend to you my welcome and the welcome of the staff upon your first visit to the offices of your Centre. My colleagues and I have awaited your arrival with excited anticipation for it is the Board we seek to serve, and it is from you that we await the definition of our tasks.

In law the International Development Research Centre is this Board assembled. Yet if we are successful in our deliberations the Centre will assume an identity and an existence distinct from the present Board and staff, and from those who follow us. In the next few months our task is to nurture the Centre's internal organizational ethos and its capacity to address the issues of development.

We begin with many assets. The broad scope granted to us by Parliament is virtually unprecedented among world instruments of development assistance created by governments. The proposed resource base for our operations initially and in the longer term is sufficient to permit us to plan and execute an aggressive programme which will equal in size the efforts of all but the very largest of the world's private foundations. Indeed, we are constrained only by the awesome knowledge that our individual and collective responsibility must be reckoned in direct proportion to the freedom and support given to us.

The International Development Research Centre is a public corporation. Within the familiar framework of corporate organization we are the directors; our shareholders, the people of Canada; our clients, the world's poor. Our shareholders have established the enterprise because they believe that this form of organization can best address the problems of creating, adapting and transferring technologies which, when applied, will accelerate the blurring of the line between deep poverty and towering affluence that now separates the mass of mankind from the few.

In the perspective of man's evolution, social and material progress has arisen from only two sources: altered technical relationships among the factors used in the processes of production, and the enhancement of human skills and abilities.

A review of the hominid tenure of the planet would reveal only three major conjunctions of invention that have set new courses for human history. The first is lost to enquiry. It was the beginning of the assertion of hominid dominance by an hominoid being that walked upright and used crude weapons and tools to hunt and gather food probably aided by a rudimentary social structure and a learned means of communication. For tens of millions of years the ancestors of man and eventually man himself refined these early technologies and carried them throughout the globe.

The next invention was more recent, perhaps little more than ten thousand years ago. It was the invention of crop agriculture and the methods of domesticating animals for use as labour and food. It was possible to build the elaborate material and social edifices of the neolithic civilizations using the surpluses produced by a sedentary farming peasantry. And over many millenia agricultural technology became almost as ubiquitous as homo sapiens himself.

The third stimulus is less than 200 years old. It was the invention of modern scientific methodology and the technique of applying scientific knowledge to human pursuits. The attributes of the modern age displaced the neolithic legacies in only a few of the many elaborate but disparate social systems spawned in that earlier period. The impact of the components of the modern transformation was felt initially by the cultures surrounding the northern reaches of the Atlantic basin and it spread first to parts of the world peopled by those who shared the cultural heritages of this basin. One hundred years ago it reached into Japan. Fifty years later it became the dominant theme of Russian development.

For the past two decades the myriad themes of modern technology have provided the corpus for the efforts to promote international development. In effect those nations which are already modernized have sought to spread the form and substance of the transformation

to the large number of neolithic and pre-neolithic societies hitherto by-passed by movements of change.

On the time scale of a perspective that seeks to turn human history on the fulcrum of technology and accompanying skills, the experience of a decade or two can have little import. What is critical to our deliberations is an explicit recognition of the process we support when we seek to assist international development.

By current standards the hominid revolution was founded on extremely primitive technology, but it was one which enabled man to populate the earth. The technical foundations of the neolithic age were a major advance on the older capabilities to meet human wants from the environment. These techniques spread to most regions of the globe through the conquests of more advanced cultures or by the whims of an unplanned and uncontrolled process of diffusion. The first era required millions of years to reach its zenith. The second age was measured in the thousands. The very nature of the third transformation contains within its scientific rationality the promise of a capacity to plan and control its transfer between societies and its dispersion throughout the world. A major part of man's history during the third quarter of the 20th Century will be a recital of the interplay between the efforts to effect the transfer and the search for the rational modalities of its effectuation.

The efforts took on international significance when President Truman proposed to Congress in 1949 the funding of an aid programme designed to help newly independent nations achieve rapid economic growth. The proposal had its origin in then prevailing historical currents — the obvious close of the age of European colonialism, the cold war power plays of great nations, the compensating generosity of a people spared the extreme horrors of a war that spread personal suffering and physical devastation over much of two continents, and perhaps most important of all, the euphoric belief that the spectacular success of the Marshall Plan in reconstructing war ravaged Europe could, without too much difficulty, be replicated in the world's new nations.

The Marshall Plan experience and the conventional wisdom of economic science lay great stress on the transfer of capital goods — the so-called tools of production. And on the building of the basic economic and institutional infrastructure required as a pre-condition for reaching a stage where the growth of the recipient economy was accelerated to a point that would generate and sustain its own further expansion dynamic.

The theory was simple. It was embodied in a few differential equations and aerodynamic models. Unfortunately by the mid-fifties a disconcerting gap appeared between the models and reality.

A reassessment of the post-war European experiment suggested that capital goods transfers to that continent generated a high rate of return because European labour was skilled in their use. The corollary led to the conclusion that capital goods transferred to countries without skilled workers would be productively sterile until investment was made in the education and training of human resources. The result was the addition to aid offerings of support for academic and vocational education designed to ensure the creation on a sustained basis of a growing pool of human skills to meet the needs of dynamic national economies and changing societies.

The new emphasis on education lessened neither the need for the passage of capital goods, nor the importance of activities to build the economic infrastructure in the increasing number of emergent nations. It was not until fears of impending famine forced a close examination of efforts to transform traditional agricultures did the realization come that embodied in the transfer campaign were the technologies of applied science developed in and suited to the modern donor cultures; technologies largely unadapted to the particular needs of the recipient peoples.

Help from the advanced countries to modernize the agricultural economies of newly emergent nations had been a major component of international aid from its earliest stages. At the outset it was considered an easy task. The success of most advanced countries in modernizing their own agricultures was one of the great chapters of the age of science, and there was an understandable eagerness born of humanitarian motives to repeat this story throughout the world.

But the extension agents and crop production specialists lifted from Europe and America to exotic lands did not achieve their goal of eliminating want or of generating farm surpluses to underpin general economic advance. By 1960 the failure of agricultural output to keep pace with food demand in many tropical countries threatened the whole structure of their fledgling economies.

There were many conjectures about the reasons for the slow growth of farm output. In retrospect the most valid ones concentrated on the applicability to tropical geography of many of the modern techniques of agriculture developed for temperate climes. The consequence of this view was the initiation of systematic approaches to bring the methods of modern scientific research in agriculture to finding solutions within the tropical countries for some of the vexing difficulties constraining the growth of food output.

These approaches brought to bear in selected developing nations the techniques used in modern societies for managing large scale, multi-disciplinary teams of research scientists working jointly toward an enunciated goal.

The transfer of capital and education was now complemented, at least in the agricultural sciences, by the transfer of the modalities that underlie the creation of new scientific knowledge and its application to the discovery of new and situation-relevant techniques of production. The results have not been disappointing. Food output increases in many tropical nations have reached beyond demand growth, and there is ample evidence that ancient agricultures are being altered by modern techniques of farming.

But in this very alteration there is also evidence of the task not completed. The approach taken in agriculture focused primarily on enhancing food availability. The research teams concentrated on the identifiable technical barriers to greater farm output and undertook to overcome or circumvent them. In doing so, they implicitly or explicitly ignored many of the social and economic consequences of providing the technical base for a dynamic agriculture that meshed readily with the foundations of a growing national economy. In other words, the single purpose focus on production research neglected the many other complementary components that comprise the totality of a national agriculture.

The progression from capital transfers to the transfer of methods of applied scientific investigation has been a logical sequence of events. Despite a current fashion in some circles to question the wisdom or even the usefulness of carrying the methods of modern technology to traditional societies, I believe that nothing can prevent the eventual metamorphosis from neolithic to modern for all mankind. To suggest that modern technology or the means to its development should be shunned because it appears to carry with its adoption uncertain and unwanted side effects begs the crucial issues of our times. The alternative to scientifically derived technology is not a society free of the effects of technology, it is a stagnant society built upon older means of fashioning tools and organizing and practising the arts of production. Eschewing modernity can stay the familiar only temporarily; the power of science and its technical spawn for altering irreversibly the patterns of cultures and civilizations cannot be countered by a wishful asceticism or the vigorous proclamation of the virtues of peasant nobility. All human culture rests on some form of technology, and within the short span of a few generations it will be founded universally on the rationality of applied science. But in being so founded the manifestations of technology and the social adjustments it requires in each society will reflect more the diversity of man than his sameness, more the flexibility of scientific enquiry and of social adaptation than is bespoken in the natural laws and the narrow perceptions of contemporary men.

The progressive embraciveness of the substance of the assistance moving between modern and ancient cultures cannot be extended further. The transfer of contemporary technologies for applying science to discover new technologies is where the progression must end. The next step would be help in fashioning the social adaptation to and the cultural absorption of the bounty of this age. This step must necessarily be the prerogative of sovereign peoples for it is a step that they alone can design and take. And even if we wished to help and they desired our counsel, what, in truth, could we give? We are still grappling in uncertain apprehension with our own cultural adaptation to the forces of our time. In our economic and technological affluence we are beset by blights that fester seemingly beyond cure. Indeed, our society displays little to lead to a conclusion that there is wise or even experienced counsel we can give to others on the ways to absorb smoothly the immense forces for cultural disruption of the present era.

The quest for a social order that can adapt and adjust to the demand and potential of modern technology is being pursued by nearly all of man's cultures. If the more advanced of these can give but little guidance to those who follow, they can at least provide the mechanisms by which all may share their separate experiences and methodologies of the hunt. From this compared knowledge may come the insights that will permit both rich and poor peoples to integrate rationally and with forethought the technical foundations of their individual futures with the cultural legacies of their varied pasts.

If the ultimate conformations of different national adjustments to the age of technology are obscured from prediction by the lack of a prototype, there are many harbingers to suggest that modern civilizations will seek through manifest social policies to assure each individual some measure of equality in his claims on opportunity and income. The abundance that pours from applied scientific technology promises the elimination of human want. It is this that fascinates the world's poor. But the promise can be lost to frustrated rage if the fruits of modernity are gathered by only the few. Too often in the two-decade history of international development the share of the poor in progress is reckoned zero. Such a reckoning cannot continue and leave any hope that the transformation from ancient to modern can occur without mass wrath made evident. However, the ever louder assertion of the right to distributive justice rings with odd harmony against the background chords of allocative efficiency so long the dominant theme in aid allotments and in the appraisal of a nation's progress.

The justifications for emphasizing allocation measures in the search for development priority have roots deep in the traditions of economic science, but there is about them an air of peculiar neglect of the genuineness of human vitality and the urgent authenticity of human poverty. The indignation provoked by this neglect demands now that allocative efficiencies be sought within a framework of distributive justice; that the quest for the levers of growth be tempered by an equally assiduous search for the fulcra of welfare; and that progress be measured as the means of satisfying real human need, not as an end product of an heroic accounting exercise. While the obligation for resolving successfully these often contradictory demands rests with foremost weight on those who lead each nation, the substance and the conditions from which they spring cannot be disregarded by any who aspire to be instrumental in giving added vigor to the accomplishments of development.

I believe this perception of human history was implicit in the conceptions of those who contributed to the establishment of the International Development Research Centre. There is, however, no easy translation of these into the specific terms of an action mandate. Our deliberations of the next three days must shape and temper and hone the cutting edge of the instrument we wield.

At the outset of our deliberations I think it is critical to recognize explicitly that modernizing ancient peoples ultimately entails a totality of cultural change. In the charge placed upon us by Parliament there is virtually no aspect of this process occurring anywhere on earth that is closed to our scrutiny and effort. The options and the opportunities before us are truly myriad. The exercise of prudent stewardship demands that we strive first to select from among these alternatives those few which we believe can be addressed effectively within the limits of our resources and the administrative capacities of our staff.

I believe it is crucial to our undertaking that great care be exercised in choosing the focus of our efforts. We seek to apply science directly and through research to the needs of development, and to help in creating in developing regions a capacity that will enable them to bring to bear the methods of scientific enquiry to the solution of their own problems.

The fulfillment of these aims requires a willingness to sustain for prolonged periods of time most of the activities we launch. Significant research results are seldom attained without the perseverance of scientist and management. Even less tractable to the passage of time

are the complex set of factors that must be ordered to build successfully the institutional capacity to promote change within the low income regions of the world.

In setting programme priorities, we cannot afford the indulgence of pursuing the various seasonal fashions set by the bevy of development designers whose responsibilities seldom reach beyond the next journal article or their last consultancy. The commitments we make as a Board will often set in motion a chain of circumstances which will reach fruition only a decade or two later. We must be prepared to recognize and accept the risks inherent in the responsibility for such decisions. We can only hope to make these risks minimal by moving with such deliberation now.

I would suggest that we select now a programme stress that seeks to promote the welfare of peoples both farm and non-farm living in rural areas throughout the world. This would provide a broad umbrella under which the Centre's staff would select and develop worthy projects for consideration over the next few years. It would prove possible to build a total programme of interlocking activities that would, in time, form the ribs of the umbrella onto which could be sewn the fabric of world advance.

My colleagues and I suggest a concern for rural peoples because it is they who are most directly affected by the change from neolithic to modern. We place emphasis on directing our efforts to the welfare of these peoples because we believe that the process of modernization is relevant only when it serves to increase the material and social well-being of those affected by its course.

In suggesting that the major thrust of the Centre's work focus on rural peoples and their well-being, I realize that I am excluding large areas of research need – an address to the details of present urban problems; the development of ways to improve public administration (at least insofar as it is not related to the transformation of rural areas); the finding of new methods of rationalizing world communications, transportation and trade patterns; the determination of improved systems for economic planning and development management; and on, and on. The list of exclusions is a long one. But it is precisely my intent that it should be. I seek by this suggestion the sharp delineation of the boundaries within which the Centre will find the purpose of its early endeavours. Until our resources and management capacity are adequate to a larger, more comprehensive programme, my colleagues and I feel this concentration is more than sufficient – the quest for the welfare of rural peoples will challenge fully our capabilities and our budget.

Under this topical umbrella we can build and support research in agriculture, forestry and fisheries, tapping as needed a rich Canadian academic and industrial knowledge in these specialized activities. We can also address the nub of the problem of population expansion, and the attendant issues of generating gainful employment for the rural populace by improving productivity and enhancing livelihood opportunities in farm and off-farm occupations, stressing particularly the creation of expanded labour absorption potentials within the frame of a dynamic rural village, small town, and larger growth centre in an effort to reduce the flow of people into the cities. Reducing this flow will relieve the swelling of these concentrations of humanity by attacking the root cause of urban growth.

Indeed, the whole space of rural life would hold our attention: education, nutrition, local government and administration, social institutions, the measures necessary to protect and preserve the rural environment, and the physical health of the rural family are but a few of the issues encompassed by the umbrella.

In emphasizing the welfare components of rural progress we will seek first to find ways to bring help to those who are least able to benefit immediately from presently available technologies. It is not the large farmer of the Punjab who would claim our initial heed, but the landless labourer who is his neighbour; and we would direct our first regard to the progress of the small holder of Latin America, not to that of the larger rancher.

But whatever choice we make from among our programme alternatives, it is the philosophy of approach to our endeavours that will establish the welcome accorded to the Centre among developing peoples.

The report of the Pearson Commission identified an aid weariness in many donor nations. I am sure the Commission also encountered an aid weariness among the recipients. It is a weariness born of being too long a supplicant suffering the donor's quiet arrogance and his implicit denial of sovereign equality. In the case of research institutions that play a donor role, this recipient weariness is aggravated by a fear that the alleged benefits of collaboration are in reality illusory.

There are many dimensions of this fear, and it is articulated in many ways. For some it is a suspicion that the priorities of support will only imperfectly reflect the order of primacy that would be established by the recipient society acting without a prior dialogue with an external agency. For others it is an apprehension that alien monies can and will be used to seduce the energies of scarce talent away from the investigation of critical local issues. For still others the suspicions arise from a concern that the donor and the personnel he so willingly assigns to a project are covert carriers of the unwanted values of an alien culture. There are others who find their nervousness founded upon personal experience with the professional aggressiveness of an outsider eclipsing their own confidence and lowering their own status in the eyes of their compatriots. Still others reflect the countless angry frustrations that seem to strew the path of co-operative research through the mismatches in competency and dedication brought to the collaborative task by the representatives of each culture.

I have no easy or sure formula for mitigating these fears. A careful review of their genesis and of the experience of other organizations in grappling with them suggests that the style of operation, the willingness of the donor organization to sustain its interest and support, and the competency and long term commitment of the non-local personnel involved are the important ingredients in a partnership that replaces fear with trust, suspicious withdrawal by eager collaboration.

I will turn first to the style of the Centre's operation.

I do not envisage the early creation in Ottawa of a large inhouse research capacity, nor the residence of more than a very few senior research workers. Contracts with selected academic, public or private research institutions in Canada and elsewhere, supplemented by short period consultancies or term staff appointments, will provide the flexibility and responsiveness needed for programme management without encumbering the

Centre's permanent establishment with a surfeit of specialized personnel whose skills may be obsolete for future requirements.

In formulating a co-operative programme of grants and contracts with other institutions, I suggest that wherever possible it be our aim to involve several institutions and countries, and to tie the supported research and training activities of the co-operating parties into a true collaboration that weaves an international net. To make this effective and to allay the charge that we are dictating priorities, I propose that we use our resources to supplement locally supported activities and that our efforts be directed primarily to expanding the horizons of indigenous research workers by giving them improved facilities and greater opportunities to collaborate closely with associates elsewhere in the world engaged in similar problems. This would suggest that our financing cover such items as the foreign exchange, costs of equipment, the foreign training of personnel, the provision of specialized external assistance as needed, and the cost of international travel to facilitate an exchange among the several collaborating partners.

Of these suggestions only that relating to travel can be considered innovative. Because of the nature of most aid arrangements, it has been easier to bring an African or an Asian research worker to North America or Europe, or to send a North American or European to Africa or Asia, than to effect visits by Africans and Asians across their national and regional borders. Under the present proposal we would open a wider traffic in international scholarly exchanges by building into our collaborative understandings substantial support for visits and meetings among researchers within and between the developing regions.

It is expected that the major portion of the Centre's resources will flow to institutions and professionals in the low income countries. It is my view that from among our corporate objectives the most significant is the charge upon us "to assist the developing regions to build up the research capabilities, the innovative skills and the institutions required to solve their problems" (International Development Research Centre Act 4 (1) (b)). To pursue this objective we must strive to involve directly in our programmes the personnel and institutions indigenous to the developing regions. The collaborative partnerships we form will transfer to our associates in the developing regions full responsibility for their portion of our joint endeavours. Our aim must be the creation of local capabilities to foster development through the application of science to create new, or adapt older, technologies to solve local problems.

In establishing the Centre's stance toward co-operating institutions and research workers, I hold that it must be founded on a confidence that they, not we, are the best judges of what is relevant to their circumstances. Until this confidence is proven misplaced, I will be content to leave the direct management of our support in the hands of our partners, reserving to ourselves only the rights of audit and periodic substantive review. If the collaborative net involved in a particular project is built to encompass several parties, and if these parties are encouraged to meet frequently to review their findings and the progress of their joint work, I would expect the group to devise its own techniques for self-monitoring so that a minimum of overall supervision will be required from us. If this is successful, we will have pioneered a new style of international operation that can remove the stigma of charity and donor control from the support of research in development.

A few paragraphs earlier I urged the need to recognize that the Centre's programme must be founded upon a willingness to sustain support for many of our projects over substantial periods of time. The assurance of continued support is also critical in establishing the reputation of the Centre in Canada and abroad as an organization deeply committed to its goals and to the functional capacities of the people and institutions it joins in partnership. The level of trust placed in an association with the Centre will be related directly to the perseverance and patience we display in the face of the ebb and flow of the fortunes of affiliation. Perseverance and patience are practised best when arrangements among confederates are left flexible and open to alteration and adjustment in the light of changing circumstances.

These principles will underlie most of the collaborative agreements presented for consideration.

Another component for lessening the potential for tension in our relations with persons abroad is a guarantee that our staff, and any others acting on our behalf, hold a high level of professional competence and skill. Few circumstances are more aggravating to professionals in low income countries than being asked to accept as a colleague an outsider whose salary is many times larger but whose experience and vocational skills are substantially less than his own.

In assembling the staff of the Centre it is my intention to hire only from among those whose professional dedication and capability are without question. And I intend to select from among this group for career appointment only those who demonstrate a sensitivity to and a respect for the personal and cultural heritage of their colleagues and associates in the developing regions.

I anticipate that most of our direct operations will be overseas and that the majority of our staff will be located in the arena of development action. At headquarters, therefore, we would have only a lean and highly professional programme group engaged in the development and management of our project activities, along with the Centre's administrative and supporting staff, and library personnel.

There must be a substantial allocation of Centre resources for training persons from developing areas, but such training is best undertaken as a component of a specific Centre project that places it in the wider context of a main thrust development programme. Indeed, it is likely that few projects will be placed before you that do not involve commitments to the improvement of human skills.

In offering training and programme leadership to developing nations, Canada is particularly favoured in its ability to give meaningful assistance to both French and English speaking peoples. In formulating the Centre's programme emphasis, the two language capacity will be fully exploited to address the particular development needs of countries in each linguistic group.

It is my intention to place before you at each regular meeting a list of project proposals we have received or

have initiated and prepared within the Centre accompanied by an executive recommendation on the disposal of each. In most cases, the projects I recommend for Board support will involve persons and institutions in developing countries and they will focus on topics that have a wider significance for development than the idiosyncratic needs of one country. In other words, the bulk of the Centre's support will be concentrated on problems of regional and international significance. I stress the latter in the belief that our purpose is multi-national in scope and that we should strive to generate discoveries that have wide geographic application. There are many sources of aid suited to assisting in the solution of problems that are country-unique. I feel that a concentration on finding solutions to problems which have multi-nation meaning can be one of our most important contributions to world development. I would hope that in the future we will be able to provide other assistance agencies with individual research results that have an investment potential for many countries.

In preparing recommended project proposals I have asked the programme directors to have prospective participants focus first on the overall goals that are sought. I believe that the capacity to judge wisely among our allocation alternatives rests upon a clear understanding of the ultimate purpose to be served by our support.

The linkages between the larger goal and the project aim itself are also important. It is from these we can draw the foreseeable implications of the proposed work for society and nation. An understanding of such implications may permit us to speculate about the many other aspects of the technological and social system into which the project must ultimately fit if it is to have meaning for the alleviation of human want. Such speculations may reveal the nature of the constraints in the total development system that could act in the future to prevent the successful application of the project findings. They may even cause us to broaden present proposals to include needed prior research on some other aspect of the whole we seek to influence.

I have asked too that whenever possible the specific organization and goals of a project be enunciated in terms that will allow an accurate periodic assessment of its course so that full advantage may be taken of the flexibilities that are built into each project outline.

In general, I believe that most of what we undertake should be strongly purposive, sharply defined, and clearly susceptible to intermittent appraisal by those who are partners in the enterprise.

The ultimate purpose of our endeavours is to secure the benefits of modern science and technology for the development of low income nations. We are not alone in holding this purpose. Much of the time of my office in the next several months will be devoted to establishing links between the Centre and the many national and international agencies now engaged in development activities. Through these links I will seek to co-ordinate and, where it seems useful, to mesh our programmes with theirs.

These are the visions and the operating philosophies of your executive. Most of them are only rough hewn, and all of them require much careful attention to become functional. My colleagues and I are not timid people, and we will not be afraid to use the mallet and chisel to sculpture the shape that will be known as the International Development Research Centre. Because of our industry we expect to make mistakes, but we expect also to learn as much from our artlessness as from our art.

The early period of the Centre's history must inevitably be devoted to a search for its role in world development and for its methods of operation within that role. We need a clear delineation of the bounds within which the search will take place and the flexibility to bring to its accomplishment both artistry and craftmanship.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
RESEARCH CENTRE

The International Development Research Centre is a public corporation established by Act of the Canadian Parliament "to initiate, encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the means for applying and adapting scientific, technical and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of those regions, and, in carrying out those objects

(a) to enlist the talents of natural and social scientists and technologists of Canada and other countries;

(b) to assist the developing regions to build up the research capabilities, the innovative skills and the institutions required to solve their problems;

(c) to encourage generally the co-ordination of international development research; and

(d) to foster co-operation in research on development problems between the developed and developing regions for their mutual benefit."

Head Office:
P.O. Box 8500, Ottawa,
Canada K1G 3H9